REMARKS

The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated September 12, 2007. Claims 1-34 are all the claims pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 21, 25, 28, 29, and 34 are amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter is added. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement in the Office Action Summary of a claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119.

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cho (U.S. 6,934,565). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

102 rejections

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cho.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for improving a sound quality of an MFD including "filtering an oscillation frequency component from the amplified audio signal, wherein the filtering is performed by a filtering unit comprising high pass filters."

Col. 4 lines 40-46 of Cho describe a mobile terminal where "the first audio filter is connected to an input device of the differential amplifier and the second audio filter is

connected to an input/output device of the differential amplifier. It is still preferable that the first audio filter has a characteristic of a high pass filter and second audio filter has a characteristic of a low pass filter." (Emphases added). This passage makes clear that any amplified signal passes through a low pass filter. There is absolutely no discussion of an amplified signal connecting to a high pass filter. Applicant submits that a low pass filter is patently distinguishable from a high pass filter, and as such Cho expressly teaches away from the invention as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Fig. 3 of Cho explicitly shows that the amplifier receives the audio signal from the high pass filter. Thus according to Cho, either the amplifier receives a signal from the high pass filter (Fig. 3), or the amplifier sends a signal to a low pass filter (Col. 4 lines 40-46). Therefore Cho cannot teach "filtering an oscillation frequency component from the amplified audio signal, wherein the filtering is performed by a filtering unit comprising high pass filters," as recited in amended claim 1. That is, Cho suggests a reverse flow of signals from that recited in claim 1, such that instead of signal flow from the amplifier to the high pass filter, the signal flows from the high pass filter to the amplifier.

For the reasons stated above, Cho does not teach all of the elements recited in amended claim 1, but instead teaches away from the claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is distinguishable over the cited reference. Additionally, as amended, independent claims 4, 10, 12, 21, 25, 28, 29, and 34 include elements similar to allowable claim 1, and thus, are each believed to be allowable

for reasons similar to those discussed with regard to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 11, 13-20, 22-24, 26-27, and 30-33 are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence on the allowable independent claims 1, 4, 10, 12, 21, 25, 28, 29, and 34.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: December 12, 2007

By: _____
Lew Edward V. Macapagal
Registration No. 55,416
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884